DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 774 RC 013 819

AUTHOR Spoonley, Paul
TITLE The Polynesian and Educational Inequality in New Zealand.
INSTITUTION New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Wellington.
PUB DATE 2 Dec 81
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented to the Joint NZARE-AARE Special Interest Seminar (Palmerston North, New Zealand, December 2, 1981). For related documents, see RC 013 820-823.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; *Language Acquisition; *Language Attitudes; Language Planning; *Language Role; *Multilingualism; Official Languages; *Policy Formation; Political Influences
IDENTIFIERS Asia (Southeast); Maori (Language); Maori (People); *New Zealand; *Polynesians

ABSTRACT

New Zealand shares with other Southeast Asian nations two sets of problems which stem from the presence of several distinct communities in one geographical/political area: the first relates to treatment of linguistic minorities, indigenous and immigrant; the second is that of social or regional dialects which, while not totally distinct from an official language used in schools, are sufficiently different to cause acute problems of communication, or to become focal points of ethnic assertiveness. Several topics dealing with languages and education are explored: policy questions, reactions of authorities, principles for language planning, language and ethnicity, personality and territoriality, the fate of vernaculars, language and political unity, costs and benefits, modernization, social and political outcomes, values and value judgements, standardization of major regional and ethnic languages, and unity in diversity. It would not seem unreasonable to expect that some provision for study of minority languages such as Samoan, Greek, Polish, Cantonese, and Serbo-Croatian should be made in the New Zealand secondary school system on at least as generous a basis as that provided for children in the Maori community to study Maori in the 1940s. Whatever their form and content, "educational" policies affecting language use in linguistically diverse societies are political, not pedagogical, in essence. (BRR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225774

THE POLYNESIAN AND EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY IN NEW ZEALAND

Paul Spoonley

Department of Sociology
Massey University

Paper presented to the
joint NZARE-AARE seminar,
Massey University
Palmerston North
2 December 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. A Pickens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC013819

> The language of Terong Pipit does not have any bearing on the written modern Malay of the Kedah man.
>
> - Asmah Haji Omar

Multilingualism is one characteristic of Southeast Asian nations which New Zealand, the most southeastern nation in the region, does not seem to share. Little more than 100,000 of New Zealand's foreign born residents at the time of the 1976 census had come from areas where English was not the major vernacular. Even if there were an equal number of locally born speakers of the languages represented by these migrants, and the 60,000 or so native speakers of Maori are taken into account, close to 90 per cent of New Zealanders would have English as their first language.[1]

Since even the most flexible measures of linguistic heterogeneity on a national scale appear to require that no one language be the mother tongue of more than 90 per cent of the population,[2] it would seem that discussions of multilingualism in education have only marginal relevance to New Zealand, and, conversely, that the New Zealand situation has little significance in such discussions. What is true of the whole, however, is not necessarily true of the parts, and just as there are large areas of indisputably multilingual countries like the Philippines, for example, where most people have a single mother tongue, there are also parts of New Zealand where no one language is the mother tongue of anything like 90 per cent of the population. In

the northern part of the country, for example, there are substantial numbers of people who continue to speak Maori, the indigenous Polynesian language, which is also widely taught as a subject in New Zealand schools. In metropolitan Auckland, the largest urban area, and Wellington, the capital, there are a number of public schools whose pupils are native speakers of languages as diverse as English, Greek, Samoan, Cantonese, and Gujurati, with no one linguistic group predominating. Added to this diversity is the fact that there are now more speakers of certain Polynesian languages, such as Niuean, Tokelauan, and possibly Cook Island Maori, resident in New Zealand than in their original homelands.

New Zealand thus shares with other Southeast Asian nations two sets of problems which stem from the presence of several distinct communities in one geographical and political area. The first of these relates to the treatment of linguistic minorities, indigenous and immigrant: in New Zealand, speakers of languages like Maori, Dutch, Samoan, German, Serbo-Croatian and Greek. In this respect the New Zealand situation is less complicated than that in some other countries in the region, as at least there is a linguistic majority, rather than an aggregation of minorities. The other problem, which has to be faced by education systems in many countries which are otherwise homogenous linguistically, concerns the treatment of linguistic polarities -- that is, social or regional dialects which, while not totally distinct from an official language used in the schools, are sufficiently different to cause acute problems of communication, or to become the focal points of ethnic assertiveness. In New Zealand, such 'polarities' would include ethnically based dialects like the somewhat elusive "Maori-English", as against the standard spoken English of the schools, and the more easily observed regional dialects of Maori as against the

standardizing influences implicit in the language used in school text books.[3]

As with most other linguistic definitions, the illustrations of 'linguistic polarities' and minority 'languages' which I have given represent ideal cases. Many speech communities speak languages that could be regarded as representative of either category; I suspect that Malay as spoken in Kedah may be a case in point, when looked at in relation to Bahasa Malaysia. It is for this reason that I began with a reference to the fate of Terong Pipit and the linguistic heirs of this story[4] -- a fate which symbolizes the problems confronting teachers and pupils when the language of the home and, often, of the immediate community has little or no place in the school and in the wider world which the school represents.

POLICY QUESTIONS

The way in which actual or potential conflicts between the home language and the linguistic requirement of the school are resolved has far reaching implications for the development of the individual pupil, his linguistic community, and the nation in which he lives. There are a host of policy questions which must be decided by authorities at various levels: whether the local or home language should play any part at all in a child's formal education; if it should, to what extent; what is to be done if there is more than one 'local language' spoken as a mother tongue by pupils at a particular school or in a small educational district; what role is to be accorded to regional, immigrant, national, and international languages.

These questions do not affect the school alone. In fact, as many authors have pointed out, the school is more often led by forces already at work in the larger society in respect to language policies, as in other matters, than it is in itself a force for linguistic or social change.[5] The importance accorded to various languages within the school system is therefore likely to be a reflection of language policies and practices on a wider scale -- in publications, radio, television, commerce, government offices, and so on. The educational significance of a language is likely to be dependent on these external factors, which also profoundly influence the degree to which speakers of a particular language continue to use it and to transmit their knowledge of it to succeeding generations.[6]

REACTIONS OF AUTHORITIES

The reaction of educational and political authorities to linguistic diversity has varied in time and place. Some complex societies have developed linguistic hierarchies, with bilingual elites functioning as intermediaries between the various administrative, geographical, and social levels and units (Mogul India is probably the classical example of this kind of solution)[7], whereas in others a single standard language has evolved (or been imposed) as the primary or sole means of communication at the national level and at most or all levels of the educational system. This latter kind of solution has increasingly found favour with administrators in modern industrial societies and in developing nations alike. Often it is accompanied by genuine political idealism -- Theodore Roosevelt's assertion that 'we have room for but one language here, and that is the English language, for

we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans' sprang from the belief that the 'polyglot boarding house' inhabited by non-English speaking immigrants to the United States not only served to divide American society, but also made the immigrants easy victims for exploitation, as they were cut off from communication with the outside world and remained ignorant of opportunities for personal liberation and social advancement.[8]

The need to forge bonds of national unity among disparate linguistic and ethnic groups has been strongly felt by many political leaders (and equally strongly resisted, at times, by others) in most Southeast Asian countries, and has been a major impetus in the development of a number of national languages. Sometimes, as in Singapore, a number of languages of wider communication have been recognized as official languages, with one (Malay in Singapore's case) given special symbolic status as the national language. The Philippines has adopted a similar policy at the administrative level (but with quite different educational implications) and is attempting to create a new national language. Indonesia and Malaysia have modernized and existing lingua franca which is being promoted as the dominant language in all public domains of use. The wider use of Maori in New Zealand has also at times been advocated on nationalistic grounds.[9]

Indonesia and Malaysia have opted for an education system in which the national language is paramount at all levels (although in Indonesia at least it is not the mother tongue of the majority of pupils), with an international language (English) having an ancillary function at the upper secondary and tertiary levels. There was considerable pressure

from certain nationalist elements in the Philippines (supported by such professional bodies as the Philippine Association of Language Teachers and the Linguistic Society of the Philippines in the early 1970s) for a similar solution in that country, where major regional languages had the media of instruction for the first few years of elementary school, followed by English at all other levels, with the second official language, Pilipino (the national language until 1973) taught as a subject also at all levels. This culminated in the adoption of an English/Pilipino national bilingual education system in 1977. In its initial stages at least, the main casualty of this policy seems to have been English, the acquisition of which was heavily dependent on its primacy of place in the school system. In the Philippine case, the successful propogation of the national language has posed a real threat to the survival of some main regional languages, while, potentially at least, placing some extra obstacles in the way of those whose chances of upward mobility are closely related to scholastic success.[10]

Singapore's approach has been a more clearly pluralistic one, in theory at least, with each of the four official languages (Malay, English, Mandarin and Tamil) functioning as a medium of instruction in primary and secondary schools, in a bilingual programme in which all pupils receive instruction through English and one other official language. This provision does not mean, however, that most of Singapore's citizens have had the opportunity to receive their schooling through their mother tongue. Quite the contrary, in fact, since Mandarin, the official Chinese language, is the first language for only one tenth of

one percent of Singapore's Chinese population (most of whom are native speakers of one or other of five other Sinitic languages[11]). Perhaps partly for this reason, at the time of the 1970 census about a quarter of Singapore's Chinese population was literate in English but not in Mandarin.[12] An ostensible desire to correct this inbalance resulted in the "Speak Mandarin" campaign, launched by the government in 1978 -- a campaign directed not against English, but against the other Chinese languages spoken in Singapore (and in the view of some commentators likely to strengthen very greatly the position of English in the community at large).[13]

Outside Southeast Asia, the United States has recently moved from a single language approach to extensive experimentation in bilingual education, although the aim of this change seems to be similar to that underlying the use of the vernacular in elementary education in many other countries -- that is, the mother tongue is used as a means to more effective, even though delayed, instruction in the official language, and is not necessarily accorded any wider role in a child's schooling.[14] A more genuinely pluralistic approach seems to be followed in Romania, where a special school at primary or secondary level can be set up for as few as 15 children from any minority linguistic group, with all instruction carried out in the mother tongue. Although Romanian is the sole medium at the tertiary level, all students are entitled to write their university entrance examinations in their mother tongues. This official acceptance of linguistic diversity would seem to reflect a high degree of linguistic tolerance on the part of native speakers of Romanian, who make up 85 per cent of the country's population

but many of whom are bilingual through personal contact with members of the country's resident minorities. However, this acceptance of diversity at a personal level and within the school system (10 other languages are used in elementary education) is not reflected in the mass media -- Hungarian, spoken by 9 per cent of the population, rates only an hour a day on the national radio, and an hour a week on television. However, this token recognition of Hungarian in the Romanian mass media is far more liberal than that accorded to Maori, let alone any immigrant language apart from the all-pervasive English, in New Zealand.

PRINCIPLES FOR LANGUAGE PLANNING

Many scholars and commentators on linguistic issues have argued that national policies towards language use should be based on a coherent social philosophy accepted by the people whom it affects. Very general principles which, it has been suggested, should guide language planning include the furthering of national unity, the promotion of legitimate group interests, the development of equality of opportunity for all citizens, personal cultural and intellectual enrichment, the opening up of access to modern technological and commercial development, and the fostering of harmonious international relationships.[15] Problems frequently arise when policies intended to implement one of these principles conflict with the application of another. The bitter controversy over the status of Pilipino which raged during the 1971-72 Constitutional Convention in the Philippines illustrates this. In the end, the majority of delegates agreed with the position of those who argued that Pilipino as the national language promoted unity at the expense of equality as it favoured one ethnic group (the Tagalog speakers) on whose

language it was based, over the majority of Filipinos. The new constitution called for the development of a new Filipino national language which many delegates to the Convention intented should not be grounded in any particular vernacular.

In view of the very real problems which accompany linguistic diversity in many nations, it is by no means idle to question why multilingual societies should not try to rid themselves of this apparent curse as quickly as possible. Clearly, there may be considerable practical advantages to retaining widespread knowledge of major international languages in a community. A convincing case on cultural, humanitarian, or practical grounds can often be made for regional languages with hundreds of thousands or millions of speakers, particularly when these also have a long standing literary tradition. However, would the world, or even Northern Luzon, be much the poorer following the demise of a language spoken by a handful of headhunters who distinguish species of orchids by terms whose referential meaning can be determined only through direct experience of the situation in which they were used?[16]

Those who believe that languages have an inherent value, and that each language equally but uniquely captures parts of human experience, may well argue that the loss of Ilongot, and with it perhaps the concept of floral relativity, should not be contemplated with any less equanimity than the loss of a major world language like English. Others may argue from an evolutionary perspective like that of Dell Hymes[17], and point out that while languages like Ilongot or Tokelauan or hundreds of others spoken in remote mountain fastnesses or on isolated attols by a few dozen or a few hundred individuals could,

given time, develop into the finest vehicles for human thought, time has in fact passed them by, and the cost of facilitating their survival is just too great to contemplate seriously. Administrators in airconditioned offices in capital cities can ignore both the evolutionary and the romantic arguments, and deal in strict practicalities.

There is, nonetheless, an important philosophical problem here, which should be grappled with, irrespective of its practical significance in a given situation. If language is central to culture, as is so often argued, and culture is an essential part of human personality, can an individual's linguistic rights be separated from his human rights? That is, when we say Ilongot, or Tokelauan, or any other very minor language, doesn't count, do we in fact say that the individuals who speak these languages don't count, and thus in effect deny their humanity just because they are few and we are many?

This is the kind of conclusion which one would be forced to draw if one were to accept some of the arguments put forward in the name of cultural relativity. However there is abundant evidence that cultures can repress and enslave the human spirit, just as they can liberate and ennoble it,[18] and to the extent that they are symbolic systems expressing cultural norms and values, a similar view may be taken of the languages associated with particular cultures. How to distinguish good languages from bad is, of course, quite another problem. Nevertheless, it is possible to have a rather negative view of the worth of a particular culture or language without ipso facto regarding the members of the ethnic group or speakers of the language concerned as any less human or worthy of respect than oneself or

any other human being. More often than not, of course, such judgements are the results of prejudice and ethnocentricity rather than of reason or compassion, but this does not alter the fact that in any complex society certain cultural forms and certain languages many be much worthier of support, development or preservation, than others.

LANGUAGE AND ETHNICITY

In uncomplicated societies, people are often unaware of linguistic differences even when they themselves are, by outside standards, bilingual or even multilingual. In these circumstances, language is no more, and no less, special a part of life than eating, dressing, or working in the fields.[19] With the development of civilization however language and language variation tend to take on a special significance to most members of the community. It is in these circumstances that language alone, rather than a coherent pattern of behaviour of which language is merely a part, may be seized on as a badge of ethnicity by persons wishing to identify with a particular group, or as a means of identifying such a group by outsiders.

In many parts of the world, including Southeast Asia, language revival movements have come to the fore in recent years as the vehicle for the expression of ethnic identity by members of regional or social minorities. In some cases, such movements have their strongest support among an intellectual elite which by most other measures would seem to have thrown its lot in with the dominant cultural and linguistic group from which it now wishes to distinguish itself. At the same time,

less fortunate members of the same ethnic group may have somewhat negative feelings towards their ethnic language, even though it is their mother tongue, and they often encourage their own families to speak the language which they perceive to be more "useful" than their own.[20]

There does seem reason to doubt the necessity for ethnic identity to be associated with linguistic uniqueness, and some current attempts at language revival in the United States seem to be quite artificial, and, in a few cases, inimical to the best interests of the communities at which they are aimed, since they serve mainly to confuse people who have successfully assimilated to a different way of life, and cause unnecessary anxiety to their children.[21]

Even if particular languages, or languages in general, are thought of as having little inherent worth, however, there may be very sound pragmatic reasons for giving them a place in the school system, and thereby appearing to foster multilingualism. The distinguished American scholar Robert Havighurst speculates, for example, that the current movement for cultural pluralism may be an 'opiate for the minorities', enabling the wealthy and powerful to divert attention from real social and economic ills. Heinz Kloss has advocated bilingual education as a form of linguistic euthenasia -- a good way (to paraphrase Archdeacon Walsh) of smoothing the pillow of a dying language.[22] In some parts of the world -- and for many Maori speakers New Zealand would be one of them -- it is more important to have a language to attach oneself to in a manner analogous to patriotism ("this is my own, my native tongue"),

than it is to be actually able to use the language. This purely symbolic or "emblematic" attachment to language can be an important component of ethnic identity, one which is nourished by appropriate token gestures on the part of educators and governments, and which is quite independent of the use of the language for mundane purposes and of the degree to which it is "known" by the people to which it "belongs".[23]

Apart from the important function of keeping minorities happy, minor or local languages can be useful pedagogically in serving as a stepping stone to mastery of an official or major language. Despite some enthusiastic claims to the contrary,[24] the thrust of United States bilingual education legislation and the programmes funded under it seems to be clearly in this direction, with the major aims of enabling the pupil to replace his mother tongue with English more effectively and less painfully than in the past, facilitating increased communication between the home and school, and generally making school a more pleasant place for the young child who arrives there speaking a language other than English.[25] It is also possible that a climate of linguistic tolerance in education, for example on the Romanian model, may assist a major official language retain a vital role, as in the case of French outside the province of Quebec in Canada, by providing an alternative for linguistic minorities who would otherwise assimilate completely with a rival major language group (in Canada's case, English), thus increasing the latter's hegemony and the tensions associated with this kind of situation.[26]

PERSONALITY AND TERRITORIALITY

There are, therefore, purely instrumental, as well as romantic or aesthetic reasons for establishing multilingual school systems in certain circumstances. Where multilingualism, for whatever reasons, is accepted as a necessary or desirable part of national educational policy, decisions still have to be made as to whether linguistic diversity at the institutional level is to be recognized on a personal or a territorial basis, and in what domains within and outside the school.[27] In the Philippines, for example, despite the apparent unconcern in some quarters for the fate of the regional languages, there is undoubtedly considerable support for a policy like that advocated by the noted educator and linguist Bonifacio Sibayan, who is confident that 'with intelligent planning ... the demands of ethnicity, nationalism, and modernization can be harmonized', thus enabling English, a national language, and the vernaculars to 'contribute their share to the advancement of the Filipino'.[28] In New Zealand, stress given to the development at the local level of readers and other materials in Maori reflects, in part at least, a concern that local identity should not be submerged by a homogenous and officially propogated modern "Maori langage".

Traditionally, institutional recognition for vernaculars in the Philippines was given on a territorial basis. Pangasinan was the medium of instruction for the first few grades of elementary school in the Pangasinan speaking municipalities of Pangasinan province, in Central Luzon for example, and Ilocano in the Ilocano municipalities

of Pangasinan and in the Ilocano provinces to the north. Ilocano speakers in Pangasinan municipalities, and Pangasinan speakers in Ilocano municipalities, just had to fit in with the majority group, and if they moved to Manila children from Ilocano and Pangasinan speaking families had to cope with Tagalog (or English) from scratch. If a personality principle were to have been applied in the Philippines, speakers of the major vernaculars would have been entitled to whatever concessions were made to speakers of these languages in the education system where they lived. This would have increased greatly the problems besetting the school systems in areas like metropolitan Manila, for example, where speakers from most major languages are congregated in sufficient numbers to be entitled to their own schools under such an arrangement.

The territorial principle has also been applied to the organization of English/Maori bilingual schooling in New Zealand. The four schools with official bilingual status in 1981 served entire school districts, and the bilingual curriculum applied to each school as a whole. The teaching of Maori language as a subject was also at one time available mainly on a territorial basis -- through the high schools serving predominantly Maori communities. Personal considerations became increasingly important as the Maori population dispersed from its rural strongholds in the 1960s, however, and it has become widely accepted that, especially at secondary school level, Maori language courses should be available to all students who desire them. An attempt to make this a legal right was defeated in Parliament in 1980,[29]

but the appointment of a large number of itinerant teachers of the Maori language for primary schools, and the continuation of special courses for training of teachers of Maori at the secondary level, indicates that the government has accepted that individuals have at least a moral right to instruction in the Maori language.

While the operation of the principle of personal linguistic rights might lead to the disintegration of the school system in a country like the Philippines, it underlies the Singapore system as far as standard languages are concerned, and would have to be applied in New Zealand if this latter country were to maintain -- let alone develop -- its linguistic resources. In Singapore and New Zealand a territorial system would be inadequate -- it would unduly restrict freedom of choice and arbitrarily assign people to a linguistic group on the basis of place of residence. This is a reasonable principle in a country like the Philippines where the major vernaculars function as lingua francas in definable geographical areas. This is not the case in Singapore, nor in most parts of New Zealand. Where the Maori language is concerned, New Zealand could follow a mixed policy, as there are some parts of the country where that language still functions to some extent as a lingua franca for local purposes. But most Maori speakers live in close proximity to English speakers, and this also applies to the immigrant linguistic minorities -- various Polynesian groups, Dutch, Chinese, Italians, Vietnamese, Greeks, and so on.

The personality principle can also be a source of injustice if it is rigidly applied. For example, it is not hard to imagine, after reading some American educational treatises in which all persons with Spanish surnames are classified as Spanish speaking, a situation in which any New Zealander with a Maori name might be compulsorily taught in Maori for the first few years of schooling. This confusing of linguistic rights with linguistic needs has, in fact, led to the failure of attempts to establish bilingual education schemes for Franco-Americans in New England.[30] The same kind of problem exists in New Zealand, where the rapid expansion of the teaching of the Maori language over the last decade has caused problems for Maori children and teachers alike -- since most young Maori children in urban areas are native speakers of English, and few of these are bilingual, they are often unable to live up to a teacher's expectation that because they are 'Maori' they should be able to play a leading role in the Maori language class. Similarly, teachers have in the past expected Maori children to suffer from various linguistic disabilities[31], simply because they were 'Maori' and thus presumably from homes where English was rarely or inadequately spoken.

THE FATE OF VERNACULARS

The inclusion of unstandardized languages in a multilingual educational programme will inevitably be a source of difficulty and, often, of conflict. Schooling is intimately bound up with the development of literacy, and literacy in turn leads to the standardization and elaboration of the language concerned. It adds a new

dimension both to language and to culture. By 'reducing a language to writing' we are thus creating something new, and introducing a profound cultural change. It is legitimate to ask, therefore, whether such action is justified, both from the point of view of the outside authorities who must organize and fund this activity, and of the people who are being 'helped' in this way.[32] Less violence may be done to some minority cultures by excluding the languages associated with them from the school (except perhaps on an informal basis) than by trying to include them in a modernizing education system. In this way the ethnic language remains in the realm of the 'sacred community', and offers a temporary retreat from the pressures of cultural change represented by the school and other national institutions.

While schools may be important forces in accellerating the acquisition of competence in a dominant language (i.e. a language which is either more prestigious or more widely spoken than a local or minority group language), they are unlikely *in themselves* to be of any great help in maintaining or reviving a language which is already succumbing to the pressure of a dominant alternative. School is, after all, only one social institution among many, and it is not necessarily the most influential in determining what or how people speak. Apart from the internal dynamics of individual speech communities or ethnic groups, the communications media -- press, radio, television, and the motion picture industry -- are likely to be much more effective agents of linguistic change or linguistic stability

that is the school, as they affect the whole population, not just that segment which happens to be attending classes.

Thanks to the pervasiveness of communications media, geographical remoteness is now no guarantee of linguistic isolation, even in Southeast Asia. Modernization is also increasing contact between disparate social and ethnic groups, and reducing the effectiveness of social isolation as a force for maintaining linguistic differences. This means that languages which do not have extensive community and institutional support are unlikely to survive for long once their speakers come into contact with modernizing influences. Unstandardized languages are likely to be particularly vulnerable in this respect -- doubly so, as the changes necessitated by a process of standardization and modernization may result in their rejection by the parent speech community, who may feel that this process has profaned their linguistic heritage. While this dilemma may cause anguish to the linguistically romantic, it is often a matter of little concern to the speakers of the language concerned, who, like those Ilongots who regard themselves as Ilocanos after having been converted to Christianity, or those immigrants who have become unhypenated 'Americans' or real 'Kiwis', accept a transformation of their ethnic identity as part of their adjustment to a new social and economic order.

LANGUAGE AND POLITICAL UNITY

The relationship between linguistic and political unity is a problem which has exercised the minds of political and intellectual

leaders in many countries. Indeed, there may be a grain of truth in the assertion that nations characterized by linguistic diversity tend to be plagued by sectional rivalries more than states with a single dominant language.[33] This sectionalism can, however, be touched off by efforts to replace local languages in the name of local unity, rather than by leaving them alone. This is particularly likely to happen when the 'national' language is identified with a particular region or section of the population -- as the fate of the Tagalog based Pilipino at the hands of the 1971 Philippine Constitutional Convention demonstrated.[34] In this particular case the language had also fallen into disrepute because of the efforts of academic purists in the Institute of National Language to purge it of numerous words of Spanish and English origin which had been well assimilated into most Philippine vernaculars -- including colloquial Tagalog.

Similar, though generally less spectacular, controversies have raged in New Zealand over the propagation of the Maori language. At one extreme, Maori is regarded as an outmoded tribal language of little value, while English is seen as a unifying force symbolic of intellectual, economic, social and political progress. At the other end of the spectrum Maori is seen as a symbol of New Zealand's uniqueness as a nation -- part of the national heritage which should be maintained and developed and as a link with other Malayo-Polynesian speaking countries in the region. New Zealanders of Maori and of European origins can be found at both extremes and all points in between when opinions are voiced on this issue. Within the Maori community there has also been considerable controversy about the materials used for teaching the language, stemming from sensitivity to

comparatively minor regional dialect differences. As the range and variety of such materials has increased, however, local sensitivities have to some extent been appeased, although in the three rural officially bilingual schools (the fourth is on the fringe of a large city) much stress has been laid on teaching through the local dialect, and diligent searches have been made to find 'genuine' local words for many concepts.

COSTS AND BENEFITS

In any multilingual society, the costs of current language policies in education and possible alternative policies should be subjected to careful scrutiny.[35] Firstly (but not necessarily most importantly, except to Ministers of Finance) there are cash costs. Some of these are short term -- capital expenditure, initial teacher training and materials development, and so on. Others are long term, and may reach far beyond the scope of what is normally considered educational activity. Apart from recurrent expenses related to educational materials and personnel, the political and cultural ramifications of multilingual education may increase demands for a variety of services -- special radio and television programmes (or even stations), the translation of government documents into a variety of languages, and multilingual labels on food packages and medicine bottles. Against these costs, of course, potential economic benefits should be set, a theoretical exercise at first, but one which can be monitored in the light of actual events should a suggested policy be implemented. If enlightened multilingualism increases social harmony, for example, then one might expect a carefully planned multilingual education programme to reduce social tensions, resulting in an increase in productivity, fewer people in prisons, and less call on certain welfare services.

There are also a variety of human costs involved, many of which have been alluded to already. Linguistic differences can be a source of strain and conflict for individuals who have to try to cope with them, and in this respect any kind of policy can be costly. Language maintenance or revival moves like some of those in the United States, or the increasing attention given to Maori in New Zealand, can be a source of anxiety to individuals who are supposed to benefit from them but in fact do not want them. On the other hand a policy which compels children to cope with a strange language from the day they enter school can also be cruel to many individuals, particularly if there is an overt (or unstated but easily recognized) assumption that the child's home language is not just out of place but is definitely inferior in all respects to the language of the school. It is important, however, to try to separate out the purely linguistic elements from other sources of anxiety in these situations. Urbanization and modernization are in themselves traumatic experiences for many people, and these broader social factors, rather than simply an enforced language shift, may be at the root of the problem. When this is the case, attempting to bolster the ethnic language may simply prolong the agony.

Another objection to the use of several languages in education relates to the language learning load which an individual has to bear. If it is true, as some psychologists seem to think, that human beings have such a finite language learning capacity that whatever knowledge one has of one language automatically limits the extent to which one can develop one's knowledge of another, then multilingual people are

certainly labouring under severe handicaps. In many places, however, bilingualism or multilingualism is simply a necessary part of the human condition, no matter what goes on at school, and the inclusion of several languages in the curriculum as subjects or media of instruction simply enables individuals to study or learn to use in a disciplined way languages they would otherwise have to cope with without the benefit of any formal assistance.

Standard languages, particularly those which have international significance, are clearly worth conserving for cultural, political, and economic reasons,[36] although such conservation may not always be a practical proposition. Indigenous languages form another kind of national resource, which may also merit protection, especially since they are normally non-recoverable (the fate of the Japanese language, for example, is not dependent upon its maintenance in New Zealand, but if Maori were to disappear from this country, it is unlikely that they would survive anywhere else). In the case of major vernaculars with some outside institutional support, language education can be a positive force in language maintenance. Many minor languages, however, seemed destined for philogical butterfly collections because of forces beyond the control of educators and the influence of school systems. The survival of these languages is a political and social problem, not an educational one; just the same, educators cannot escape the responsibilities which attend their role in this process -- their advice and activities are not without influence on the course of linguistic events.

MODERNIZATION

In many societies with complex economic and social structures, there has been a traditional separation between the domestic and public domains of life marked also by differences in language. This has persisted for centuries in many areas, and has been made possible by two independent forces -- firstly, the local or ethnic language has come to represent intimacy, warmth, and social solidarity at a personal level; secondly, public activity has been compartmentalized, with the higher levels of administration and the academic sphere contributing little of conversational interest to the market place or home. Thus the Kedah man has not in the past needed to use his local language to talk about the technicalities of interplanetary travel or the difference between a Chomskyan and a Bloomfieldian analysis of Malay syntax, any more than he has needed to use written or spoken modern Malay to scold his children or praise his wife.

With the general spread of education and literacy, however, many institutional boundaries must also become less significant, and the usefulness of underdeveloped private vernaculars will be greatly diminished. A 'high' and a 'low' language of unequal development can coexist only where high and low matters are for the most part clearly separated. Once the general level of education of women is substantially raised, for example, conversation in the domestic unit is unlikely to be confined to everyday domestic matters. If the 'low' language cannot be used to discuss 'high' matters as they become increasingly relevant to daily life, then it is likely to be discarded, first by the priviledged and the successful, and, later, by the hoi polloi. To the extent that schools succeed in raising general standards

of literacy and interest in the outside world, they must also provide the means for these interests and abilities to find linguistic expressions; in multilingual societies, this must involve minor as well as major languages if it is considered desirable that the minor languages survive.

Where money is short, a heavy investment in sustaining linguistic pluralism would have to be justified in terms of a correspondingly great potential economic benefit to the nation. Linguistic diversity may enable different groups of people to live harmoniously, each secure in their own ethnic identity. On the other hand, language differences may in some circumstances symbolize other socially undesirable divisions and may in fact act as barriers to individual and group advancement. The study of languages is often proclaimed (especially by language teachers) as a great intellectual stimulus, and there is little reason to doubt that this may be so. But it may need to be shown that there are more advantages for more people in the formal development of their vernaculars alongside an official language, than in simply enabling them to study, say, an international language of proven general utility, before limited resources are diverted from one educational goal to another.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL OUTCOMES

The likely social and political outcomes of language education policies must also be followed through carefully. In New Zealand, for example, the advocates of national bilingualism in English and Maori are, in effect, lobbying for the acceptance of a policy which

would in the long run reduce the role of English to that of a language of wider communication with the outside world, and replace it in all other spheres of activity by Maori.[37] The century-long banishment of the language from elementary education, however, has meant that the ease with which native speakers can express themselves through written Maori has declined[38] (although almost all are literate in English), and, in the absence of any kind of conscious language planning, the pressures of urbanization and modernization are fast transforming the language from a flourishing vernacular to the ritual and museum piece status of its sister language Hawaiian. Some compromise between these extremes would probably be much more acceptable to most New Zealanders -- indeed, there is considerable evidence that this is so[39] -- but this is a problem to which there is no educational solution; without political support and increased exposure in the mass media, the most sophisticated bilingual programmes in New Zealand schools are unlikely to suceed even in maintaining the status quo where Maori is concerned. In the case of a very minor language with few speakers, or any minority language whose speakers are mostly scattered among speakers of other languages, no external support is likely to be beneficial in the long run. Since the final outcome, language loss, is already known, purely pragmatic criteria, tempered one would hope with humanitarian regard, can be applied. Simple recognition of the symbolic importance of such languages -- their role as an emblem for the community which regards a particular language as its own -- may be all that is needed.

VALUES AND VALUE JUDGEMENTS

It seems to me that the values which should be paramount in language planning are those related to the quality of life. I would add, however, that those engaged in formulating and implementing such plans, be they scholars, educators, administrators or politicians, should try to free themselves from ethnocentric biases when considering the fate of someone else's language. Emphasis must surely be placed on providing opportunities for personal growth and also the promotion of harmonious relations and easy communication within ethnic groups and between them. Despite the administrative and financial difficulties it may entail, the use of several different languages in education in ways which accommodate the aspirations of the ethnic communities concerned, and provision for the general use of some, and more limited use of others, in the public domain (which includes the press, radio, television and commerce as well as government), may well prove an effective means of attaining these goals.

National and international languages are indeed of vital importance, and in areas with a common linguistic base there is much to be said for the adoption of a common lingua franca and its development as a national or even as an international language (as has happened with Malay-Indonesian). Where a number of speech communities coexist, the Singapore solution of adopting a number of standard languages for administrative and educational purposes, or the Romanian support for linguistic pluralism in the school system, prove that a multilingual solution can work in practice.

STANDARDIZATION OF MAJOR REGIONAL AND ETHNIC LANGUAGES

The problem of major regional and ethnic languages, particularly those which have some kind of literary tradition and hence a measure of standardization, remains relatively unexplored. These languages are certainly part of the cultural heritage of any country, and the positive aspects of their potential importance in national development are often overlooked. The problem of standardization, formidable enough with national and international languages, is probably the most exacerbating when it comes to developing curricula for or in these languages. Modernization implies changes, but it may be essential for survival even in the short term. The smoothing out or transcendence of dialect differences is also a problem -- the dynamic of standardization is centripetal, minimizing differences in the interests of precise and efficient communication of ideas; the dynamic of usage tends to be centrifugal, with variation also serving a communicative purpose (implying differences in status, identity, and so on) while at the same time constituting barriers to communication across ethnic, national, or class lines. Because of this it is probably wisest to concentrate attention on developing a written standard, and allow much greater variation in speech. Such a course seems to have been followed successfully in the development of standard Malay at a national level[40], and of course could also be employed with regional languages characterized by localized dialect differences. By developing a heirarchy of standards with different levels of appropriateness, it should be possible to accommodate the languages of Terong Pipit, Tamahae[41] and their linguistic heirs, for as long as the latter feel

that some such accommodation is desirable.

UNITY IN DIVERSITY

The great Indonesian scholar and philosopher S. Takdir Alisjahbana has developed a theory of linguistic convergence[42] which parallels the theological speculations of the late French scholar Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on the evolutionary destiny of mankind. Both see a moral purpose in the course of human development, and, in his speculations on the significance of linguistic change, Dr Alisjahbana sees in the convergence of major languages a gathering together of the fruits of human experience. A similar view underlies the assertion made at several points in this discussion that languages which restrict their speakers to expressing only a limited range of experience through them must change or disappear. But convergence and unity do not in themselves presuppose uniformity — 'He fathers forth Whose beauty is past change', as the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins put it. Multilingualism in education can help ensure that linguistic diversity is a creative and liberating influence in human affairs, rather than a limiting and oppresive force.

Wherever possible, therefore, linguistic freedom of choice together with the assurance of access to the full benefits of citizenship are the most desirable ingredients in any educational and administrative policy in a multilingual nation. In New Zealand, this would require a much more serious effort to promote bilingual education in English and

Maori than has hitherto been the case, involving curriculum development, teacher training, and large-scale materials development projects to service bilingual schools, in addition to obtaining community backing for the establishment of bilingual curricula. Provided the tangata whenua status of Maori were not lost sight of, some provision for bilingual education for children from immigrant language minorities could well follow -- this would certainly require the recognition of the personality principle in respect of the language of education.[43] Unlike Maori, which has already clearly established itself at the symbolic level as a national language -- used even by leading politicians to open their election campaigns and to greet distinguished visitors -- the immigrant minority languages are much more closely tied to the interests and identity of particular ethnic groups. But even among these, some may have a prior claim for recognition: Niueans, Cook Islanders, and Tokelauans are all New Zealand citizens by birth, for example, and this in itself may give them a stronger claim to official backing for the propogation and educational use of their language than other immigrant groups. Nonetheless, it would not seem unreasonable to expect that some provision for the study of minority languages such as Samoan, Greek, Polish, Cantonese and Serbo-Croatian should be made in the New Zealand secondary school system on at least as generous a basis as that provided for children in the Maori community to study Maori in the 1940s.

Whatever their form and content, however, "educational" policies affecting language use in linguistically diverse societies are political,

not pedagogical, in essence. They are therefore likely to be a continuing source of conflict within the multilingual community. The real challenge to educators and citizens alike is to ensure that this conflict is constructive and creative -- a simple task, but not an easy one.

NOTES

* This is a revised and expanded version of a paper originally read at the RELC Regional Seminar on Language Education in Multilingual Societies : Its Challenges and Potentials, Singapore, April 1977.

1. Estimates based on Tables 8 and 9, NZ Census of Population and Dwellings 1976, Volume 7 : Birthplaces and Ethnic Origin (Wellington, Department of Statistics, 1980) ; for the number of Maori speakers, see Biggs 1968, Benton 1979a.

2. See Petyt 1975 for a discussion of criteria for classifying political entities according to their linguistic composition.

3. For an interesting illustration of the use of the term 'polarity' (in reference to the difference between Lallans, the lowland Scottish dialect of English, and Standard Scottish English) see Wood 1977.

4. Terong Pipit is the central character of a romance (Hikayat Terong Pipit) in the Kedah variant of Malay. The sentence quoted at the beginning of this paper is from Asmah Haji Omar's article on the standardization of Malay (1971).

5. See Edwards 1976 for a discussion of this point in relation to recent developments in bilingual schooling in the United States.

6. See Fishman et al. 1966 for a comprehensive exposition and analysis of factors influencing non-English speech communities in the United States of America. Discussion of these influences on Maori and some immigrant languages in New Zealand can be found in Benton 1976, 1979b, 1980a, 1981b.

7. See e.g. Das Gupta and Gumperz 1968.

8. See Cooke 1973, p. 299.

9. For descriptions and analyses of the linguistic situations in regard to the official and national languages in the countries mentioned in this and the following paragraphs, see Kuo 1974, 1976, Gwee 1974, Harrison 1980 (Singapore); Omar 1971, 1975, 1976, Alisjahbana 1974, Clammer 1976, Watson 1980 (Malaysia and Indonesia); Sibayan 1971, 1975, Constantino 1974, Lacuesta 1967, Yabes 1973 and Gonzalez 1980. (Philippines), Petyt 1975 (Romania), Benton 1981b (New Zealand).

10. Hokkien, spoken natively by about 90 percent of the Chinese Community, Teocheu (22 percent), Cantonese (20%), Hainanese (6%) and Hakka (5%) (see Kuo 1976 pp. 135-137). About 76 percent of Singapore's population are of Chinese origin.

11. cf. Kuo 1974 Tables 4 and 5.

12. See Benton 1980b.

13. cf. Harrison 1980.

14. cf. Edwards 1976, Greenfield 1976.

15. See, for example, Sibayan 1974, Neustupny 1968, Fishman 1972a.

16. Michelle Rosaldo, quoted in Bilmes 1975, reports that Ilongots will distinguish orchids by terms which apply only in the context of the situation in which they are uttered - i.e. the words used are equivalent in meaning to the arbitrary designation of objects by terms like 'x' and 'y', where 'x' simply means 'not y', and 'y', likewise, 'not x'.

17. See Hymes 1961.

18. See Henry 1963 for an exposition of this point of view.

19. cf. Khubchandani 1975, Fishman et al. 1966.

20. The case of Welsh in Wales is particularly interesting in this respect - see Khlief 1976, Sharp 1973, Lewis 1975, 1978, Pill 1974.

21. See Roeming 1971 for a strong statement of this point of view.

22. Havighurst 1976; Kloss 1977, pp. 277-8.

23. For an interesting discussion of the various ways in which language and ethnicity are associated, see Eastman and Reese 1981.

24. See e.g. Andersson 1971, also Buto 1975, Von Maltitz 1975.

25. See e.g. Edwards 1976, Greenfield 1976, pp. 162, Schneider 1976.

26. See Lupul 1976.

27. See McRae 1975 for a comprehensive discussion of the principles of territoriality and personality in multilingual states.

28. Sibayan 1975, p. 129. cf. also Sibayan 1974, p. 221-2.

29. Maori Language Bill, 1980 (Mrs T.W.M. Tirikatene-Sullivan) NZ Parliamentary Debates 1980, pp. 2188-2196.

30. cf. Edwards 1976, pp. 71-74.

31. See Benton 1975b, 1981b.

32. See Burnaby 1976; cf. also Roeming 1971.

33. See Fishman 1968b; cf. also Gonzalez 1980.

34. See Yabes 1973 for a detailed account of the debates and the positions of various delegates and consultants to the convention. An alternative view of the controversy is put forward in Constantino et al 1974. A non-partisan commentary on these events will be found in Gonzalez 1980.

35. For some models of cost-benefit analyses applied to language policies see Thorburn 1971, Jernudd 1971, and Strevens 1971.

36. See e.g. Fishman 1972b.

37. See Benton 1973, 1978, 1981b.

38. Benton 1975a, 1978, 1981b.

39. See Benton 1981a, 1981b.

40. See Asmah Haji Omar 1971, 1975.

41. Tamahae is a folk hero of the Whanau Apanui people in the Eastern Bay of Plenty area in New Zealand who have their own distinctive dialect of Maori.

42. See Alisjahbana 1966, especially pp. 94-98, pp. 225-237.

43. 'Tangata whenua' - 'people of the land'. For extended discussions of the policy issues surrounding bilingual education in New Zealand and other Pacific Island nations see Benton 1979c, 1981b.

REFERENCES

Alisjahbana, S. Takdir

1966 Values as Integrating Forces in Personality, Society, and Culture (Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press).

1974 'Language policy, language engineering and literacy in Indonesia and Malaysia' in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) Advances in Language Planning (The Hague, Mouton).

Andersson, Theodore

1971 'Bilingual education: The American experience' Modern Language Journal 55, 427-440.

Benton, Richard A.

1973 Should Bilingual Education be Fostered in New Zealand? (Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research).

1975a 'Initial literacy teaching: A cautionary tale' RELC Journal 6.1, 6-13.

1975b 'Language and the Maori child' in G. McDonald (ed.) Children and Language (Wellington, Association for the Study of Childhood).

1976 'The role of ethnic languages in the education of New Zealanders' in Roy Sanders (ed.) Education in CHANGE in Education Auckland, New Zealand Educational Institute, 132-144. (Also Delta 19, 1977, 24-36, and in R.J. Bates and J.A. Codd (eds.) Theory and Practice in New Zealand Education (Palmerston North, Dunmore Press).

1978 'Problems and prospects for indigenous languages and bilingual education in New Zealand and Oceania' to appear in Bernard Spolsky and Robert Cooper (eds.) Case Studies in Bilingual Education (Rowley, Massachussetts, Newbury House).

1979a Who Speaks Maori in New Zealand? (Wellington, NZCER).

1979b The Maori Language in the 1970s (Wellington, Maori Unit, NZCER).

1979c Policy Implications for English-Maori Bilingual Education in New Zealand (Wellington, Maori Unit, NZCER).

1980a 'Language factors in Polynesian and Maori education' in Graham Robinson and Brian O'Rourke (eds.) Schools in New Zealand Society: (Auckland, Longman Paul).

1980b 'The Philippine bilingual education programme - Education for the masses or the preparation of a new elite?' Philippine Journal of Linguistics 11.2, 1-14.

1981a Maori and English at Pukekaraka: Community Resources and Parental Attitudes (Wellington, Maori Unit, NZCER).

1981b The Flight of the Amokura: Oceanic Languages and Formal Education in the South Pacific (Wellington, NZCER).

Biggs, Bruce G.
1968 'The Maori language past and present' in Eric Schwimmer (ed.) The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties (Auckland, Blackwood and Janet Paul).

Bilmes, Jack
1975 'Misinformation and ambiguity in verbal interaction: A northern Thai example' International Journal of the Sociology of Language 5, 63-75.

Burnaby, Barbara
1976 'Language in native education' in Merrill Swain (ed.) Bilingualism in Canadian Education: Issues and Research (CSSE Yearbook, Volume 3) (Edmonton, Canadian Society for the Study of Education).

Buto, Kathleen A., et al.
1975 A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education (Washington, D.C., U.S. Commission in Civil Rights).

Clammer, John R.
1976 'Bahasa Malaysia: Its modernization and its relation to the politics of national unity in peninsular Malaysia' in Lim Joo-Jock and SBD de Silva (eds.) Southeast Asian Affairs 1976 (Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies).

Constantino, Ernesto, Rogelio Sikat and Pamela D. Cruz
1974 Filipino o Pilipino? Mga Bagong Babasahin sa Pambansang Wika at Literatura (Manila, Rex Book Store).

Cooke, Alistair
1973 Alistair Cooke's America (London, British Broadcasting Corporation).

Das Gupta, Jyotirindra and John J. Gumperz
1968 Language, Communication and Control in North INdia in Fishman et al, op. cit., 151-166.

Eastman, Carol M. and Thomas C. Reese
1981 'Associated language : How language and ethnic identity are related', General Linguistics 21.2, 109-116.

Edwards, J.R.
1976 'Current issues in bilingual education' Ethnicity 3, 70-81.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1968a 'Sociolinguistics and the language problems of the developing countries' in J.A. Fishman et al. Language Problems in Developing Nations (New York, John Wiley and Sons).

1968b 'Some contrasts between linguistically homogenous and linguistically heterogenous politics' in J.A. Fishman et al, op. cit.

1972a 'Planned reinforcement of language maintenance in the United States: Suggestions for the conservation of a neglected national resource' in Anwai S. Dil (ed.) Language in Sociocultural Change (Stanford, Stanford University Press).

1972b 'Varieties of ethnicity and varieties of language consciousness' in Anwar S. Dil (ed.), op. cit.

Fishman, Joshua, Vladimir C. Nahirny, John E. Hofman and Robert G. Hayden
1966 Language Loyalty in the United States (The Hague, Mouton).

Gonzalez, Andrew B.
1980 Language and Nationalism: The Philippine Experience Thus Far (Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press).

Greenfield, T. Barr
1976 'Bilingualism, ultilingualism, and the crisis of purpose in Canadian culture' in Merrill Swain (ed.) Bilingualism in Canadian Education: Issues and Research (Edmonton, Canadian Society for the Study of Education).

Gwee Yee Hean
1974 'The changing education scene' Institute of Asian Studies, Nanyang University (mimeo).

Harrison, Godfrey
1980 'Mandarin and the Mandarins: Language policy and the media in Singapore' Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 1.2, 175-180.

Havighurst, Robert J.
1976 'The relative importance of social class and ethnicity in human development' Human Development 19, 56-64.

Henry, Jules
1963 Culture Against Man (New York, Vintage Books).

Hymes, Dell H.
1961 'Functions of speech: An evolutionary approach' in F.C. Gruber (ed.) Anthropology and Education (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press).

Jernudd, Bjorn H.
1971 'Notes on economic analysis for solving language problems' in Joan Rubin and Bjorn H. Jernudd (eds.) Can Language be Planned? (Honolulu, University Press of Hawaii).

Khlief, Bud B.
1976 'Cultural regeneration and the school: An anthropological study of Welsh medium schools in Wales' International Review of Education 22.2, 177-191.

Khubchandani, Lachman
1975 'Language acquisition in plural societies' Word 27, 405-410.

Kloss, Heinz
1977 The American Bilingual Tradition (Rowley, Mass., Newbury House).

Kuo, Eddie C.Y.
1974 'Language status and literacy trend in a multilingual society - Singapore' RELC Journal 5.1, 1-15.

1976 'A sociolinguistic profile' in R. Hassan (ed.) Singapore: Society in Transition (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press).

Lacuesta, Geroncio
1967 Filipino (Manila Lingua Franca) versus Pilipino (Abacada Tagalog) (Quezon City, National Language Anti-Purism Movement).

Lewis, E. Glyn
1975 'Attitude to language among bilingual children and adults in Wales' International Journal of the Sociology of Language 4, 104-125.

1978 'Bilingualism in education in Wales', in Bernard Spolsky and Robert L. Cooper (eds.) Case Studies in Bilingual Education (Rowley, Mass., Newbury House).

Lieberson, Stanley
1970 Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada (New York: John Wiley and Sons).

Lupul, Manoly R.
1976 'Bilingual education and the Ukrainians in Western Canada' in Merrill Swain (ed.) Bilingualism in Canadian Education: Issues and Research (Edmonton, Alberta, Canadian Society for the Study of Education).

McRae, Kenneth D.
1975 'The principal of territoriality and the principle of personality in multilingual states' International Journal of the Sociology of Language 4, 33-54.

Neustupny, Jiri V.
1968 'Some general aspects of "Language" problems and "Language" policy in developing societies' in Joshua A. Fishman et al. (eds.) Language Problems of Developing Nations (New York, John Wiley and Sons).

Omar, Asmah Haji
1971 'Standard language and the standardization of Malay' Anthropological Linguistics 13.2, 75-89.

1975 'Supranational standardization of spelling system: The case of Malaysia and Indonesia' International Journal of the Sociology of Language 5, 77-92.

1976 The Teaching of Bahasa Malaysia in the Context of National Language Planning (Kuala Lumpur, Dewan Bahasa Dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia).

Petyt, K.M.
1975 'Romania: A multilingual nation' International Journal of the Sociology of Language 4, 75-101.

Pill, Roisin
1974 'Social implications of a bilingual policy, with particular reference to Wales' British Journal of Sociology 25.1, 94-107.

Roeming, Robert F.
1971 'Bilingualism and the national interest' Modern Language Journal 55, 73-81.

Schneider, Susan G.
1976 Revolution, Reaction or Reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act (New York, Las Americas).

Sharp, Derrick et al.
1973 Attitudes to Welsh and English in the Schools of Wales (London, Macmillan Education Limited).

Sibayan, Bonifacio P.
1971 'Language planning processes and the language-policy survey in the Philippines' in Joan Rubin and Bjorn H. Jernudd (eds.) Can Language Be Planned? (Honolulu, The University Press of Hawaii).

1974 'Language policy, language engineering and literacy in the Philippines' in J.A. Fishman (ed.) Advances in Language Planning (The Hague, Mouton).

1975 'Survey of language use and attitudes towards language in the Philippines', in Sirarpi Ohannessian et al. (eds.) Language Surveys in Developing Nations (Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics).

Strevens, Peter
1971 'Where has all the money gone? The need for cost effectiveness studies in the teaching of foreign languages' in G.E. Perren and J.L.M. Trim (eds.) Applications of Linguistics (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1971).

Thomas, Thorburn
1971 'Cost-benefit analysis in language planning' in Joan Rubin and Bjorn H. Jernudd (eds.) Can Language Be Planned? (Honolulu, University Press of Hawaii).

Thorburn, Thomas
1971 'Cost-benefit analysis in language planning', in Joan Rubin and Bjorn Jernudd (eds.) Can Language Be Planned? (Honolulu, University Press of Hawaii).

Von Maltitz, Frances W.
1975 Living and Learning in Two Languages: Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the United States (New York, McGraw Hill).

Watson, J.K.P.
1980 'Cultural pluralism, nation building, and educational policies in peninsular Malaysia', Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Studies 1.2, 155-74.

Wood, Robert E.
1977 'Potential issues for language planning in Scotland' Language Planning Newsletter 3.1.

Yabes, Leopoldo
1973 'Lets study the new constitution: The language provision' Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review 38.182.